

**To:** CN=Bruce Herbold/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]  
**Cc:** CN=Stephanie Skophammer/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Karen Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Karen Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]  
**From:** CN=Tom Hagler/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US  
**Sent:** Mon 1/9/2012 10:41:25 PM  
**Subject:** The Scientific Integrity Report

I just read the body of the report from the peer review, and am very interested in your thoughts on the two page "free advice" given by the panel at around pages 12 and 13,

Questions/comments for all of you:

- (1) Is this report something that could or should go our website?
- (2) The panel clearly loves the Adaptive Management Plan for Delta Smelt. I can't remember, Bruce, what you thought of it. Is this one you had some part of? If so, should it be part of the science discussion in March?
- (3) The panel lines up the several recent scientific models and says they are all legitimate but different ways of dealing with the scientific uncertainty. In the BDCP effects analysis and EIS, DWR apparently throws out all except the Deriso model. Isn't there something in the NEPA regs or 40 questions that says "When you have a scientific controversy, you need to explain it and note the different views." Looks like the panel has drafted that "comment" for us. That one is for Stephanie.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Tom Hagler  
Assistant Regional Counsel  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region 9  
75 Hawthorne Street, RC-2  
San Francisco, California 94105-3901  
Phone: (415) 972-3945  
Email: hagler.tom@epamail.epa.gov